

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/008,957	01/20/98	MORIARTY	R

BULLWINKEL PARTNERS
SUITE 1300
19 SOUTH LASALLE STREET
CHICAGO IL 60603-1493

HM12/0410

EXAMINER

BADIO, B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1616	19

DATE MAILED: 04/10/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/008,957	Applicant(s) Moriarty et al.
	Examiner Barbara Radio	Group Art Unit 1616

Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

This action is **FINAL**.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) 7-9 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 1-6 and 10-19 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

received.

received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 1616

First Office Action on the Merits of a Continued Prosecution Application

Continued Prosecution Application

1. The request filed on February 10, 2000 for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 09/008,957 is acceptable and a CPA has been established. An action on the CPA follows.

Status of the Application

2. The amendment filed December 13, 1999 was entered. Claims 1-19 are pending in the present application. Claims 7-9 stand withdrawn from consideration, as being drawn to a non-elected invention. Claims 1-6 and 10-19 stand rejected as indicated below.

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Objections

4. **The objection of claims 2-4, 10-12 and 15-17 under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim is withdrawn.**

Art Unit: 1616

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. **The rejection of claims 5-6 and 18-19 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph is withdrawn.**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. **The rejections of claims 1-6 and 10-19 under 35 USC 103(a) over (1) Holick et al. ('538); (2) Holick et al. ('643); (3) Bishop et al. ('429) and claims 1-4, 10-12 and 15-17 under 35 USC 103(a) over Gulbrandsen et al. ('790) is maintained.**

Applicant agrees that the cited references disclose a generic group of vitamin D derivatives which includes applicants' 1 α -hydroxyvitamin D₅ compounds. However, applicant argues that the claimed compound (i.e., 1 α (OH)D₅) shows unexpectedly improved properties or properties not present in the prior art based on the declaration of Dr. Robert Moriarty. The argument was considered but not persuasive for the following reasons.

Applicant refers to several prior art references in support that vitamin D compounds are known to increase serum calcium levels. However, as indicated in the previous Office Action, there is evidence in the prior art that the instantly claimed compounds have a lower tendency or inability to cause hypercalcemia and/or hypercalciuria (see US Patent 5,763,429, col. 5, line 60 - col. 6, line 13) and, thus, are useful in the treatment of certain cancers. In response, applicant argues that Bishop

Art Unit: 1616

('429) does not teach or suggest that the claimed compound has substantially lower calcemic activity than the others. The examiner agrees that the prior art does not single out the claimed compound nor does it suggest that said compound has lower calcemic activity than the other compounds. However, the ordinary artisan would not expect all of the compounds of the genus taught by the prior art to have the same degree of activity. He would expect a range of activity of the compounds taught by the prior art and, thus, that some of the compound would have a lower hypercalcemic and/or hypercalciuric activity as shown by the declaration of Dr. Moriarty. Thus, the results shown by the declaration is not considered unexpected or unobvious.

Even if the examiner agreed that the declaration of Dr. Moriarty shows unexpected and unobvious results, it does not commensurate in scope with the instant claims. In other words, applicant has only shown a difference between $1\alpha(\text{OH})\text{D}_4$ and $1\alpha(\text{OH})\text{D}_5$. Vitamin D₃ derivatives are not considered the closest prior art compounds and neither would a comparison between $1\alpha(\text{OH})\text{D}_5$ and vitamin D₃ derivatives be considered a true comparison. The examiner notes that a comparison between $1\alpha(\text{OH})\text{D}_5$ and $1\alpha,25(\text{OH})_2\text{D}_4$ would also not be considered a true comparison.

Applicant also states that there is a long felt but unmet need for a vitamin D compound useful in the treatment of cancer without the harmful increase in serum calcium levels. It is noted that the compounds taught by Bishop ('429) are said to be useful in the treatment of cancer and to also have a lower tendency or inability to cause

Art Unit: 1616

hypercalcemia and/or hypercalciuria and, thus, overcome the shortcomings of the known active vitamin D₃ compounds. Bishop teaches that vitamin D₄ and vitamin D₂ are less toxic than vitamin D₃ (see the entire articles, especially col. 6, line 57 - col. 7, line 18).

For these reasons and those given in Paper Nos. 3 and 11, the rejections of claims 1-6 and 10-19 under 35 USC 103(a) over (1) Holick et al. ('538); (2) Holick et al. ('643); (3) Bishop et al. ('429) and claims 1-4, 10-12 and 15-17 under 35 USC 103(a) over Gulbrandsen et al. ('790) is maintained.

Telephone Inquiry Contacts

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Barbara Radio whose telephone number is (703) 308-4595. The examiner can normally be reached between 7:30 am and 4 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, José Dees, can be reached on (703) 308-4628. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-4556.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

Barbara Radio
Barbara Radio
Art Unit 1616